## AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Place the sheet of drawings containing Figure 15 with the accompanying replacement sheet containing the same Figure.

In the replacement sheet, the spelling of the signal label LATCH_ST has been revised to conform with the specification.

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 6, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 11. The indication that claims 3-10 and 12-19 contain allowable subject matter, and the allowance of claims 20-30, is noted with appreciation.

The specification was objected to, on the grounds that the signal label "LATCH_ST" does not appear in Figure 15. In response thereto, a replacement sheet of drawings containing an amended version of Figure 15, is being submitted herewith. In the replacement sheet, the label for the signal has been revised, to conform with the specification.

Claims 1, 2 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102, on the grounds that they were considered to be anticipated by the Alisobhani et al. patent (US 6,760,393). The Office Action makes particular reference to the patent at column 11, line 65 through column 12, line 39, as the basis for the rejection. It is respectfully submitted, however, that this portion of the patent does not anticipate, nor otherwise suggest, the claimed subject matter.

The rejected claims are directed to a method of signal correlation, namely a determination of the phase relationship, or time shift, between a received signal and a reference signal. In contrast, the referenced portion of the Alisobhani patent is directed to the synchronization of a mobile radio with a base station. To accomplish the synchronization, the patent discloses a technique in which a unique word is repeatedly transmitted from the base station at a known interval. The mobile radio measures the number of clock cycles between successive detections of the unique word, and adjusts the frequency of a voltage controlled oscillator until the measured

numbers remain consistent. At this point, the frequency of the radio is synchronized to that of the base station.

Thus, the referenced portion of the Alisobhani patent is concerned with the adjustment of the *frequency* of a mobile radio, to synchronize it with a base station. In contrast, the claimed subject matter is directed to the detection of the *phase* of a received signal, relative to a reference signal. Since the referenced portion of the Alisobhani patent is directed to an entirely different objective, it does not teach, nor otherwise suggest, the features recited in the rejected claims.

For example, claim 1 recites the steps of identifying a feature in an input data stream and storing a starting time associated with the identified feature "relative to a boundary of the input data stream." The Office Action interprets the unique words disclosed in the Alisobhani patent as being the identified feature. However, it is not apparent from the Office Action how the reference is being interpreted to disclose the concept of storing a starting time associated with the identified feature relative to a *boundary* of the input data stream. In particular, it is not clear what is considered to be the boundary of the input signal. As noted previously, the synchronization technique of the Alisobhani patent operates by counting the number of clock cycles between successive detections of the unique word. There is no disclosure of a boundary associated with the input signal, nor the association of a starting time of a detected word with such a boundary. If the rejection is not withdrawn, the Examiner is respectfully requested to explain how the Alisobhani patent is being interpreted to disclose this claimed subject matter.

Claim 1 goes on to recite the steps of measuring a time interval until the identified feature is next repeated in the input data stream, and comparing the

measured time interval "to each of a set of a valid interval values for the identified feature." Again, it is not apparent how the Alisobhani patent is being interpreted to disclose this subject matter. In particular, there does not appear to be any disclosure of the comparison of a measured time interval to each of a set of valid interval values. Rather, in the synchronization technique of the patent, the number of clock cycles counted between two successively detected unique words is compared with the previously counted number. If the two values do not match, the frequency of the clock is adjusted. There is no disclosure of a set of valid interval values against which the measured clock cycles are compared.

Claim 1 recites the further step of calculating a difference between the stored starting time and a starting time associated with a reference data sequence when the measured time interval matches one of the valid interval values. The synchronization technique of the Alisobhani patent does not calculate the difference between the starting time of an identified feature in the input data stream with a starting time associated with a reference data sequence. In other words, there is no comparison of two data streams to one another, to determine a difference between starting times. Rather, the synchronization technique of the Alisobhani patent is only focused upon a single input data stream.

For at least these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Alisobhani patent does not anticipate, nor otherwise suggest, the subject matter of claim 1. Since claim 2 depends from claim 1, it is likewise not anticipated.

At least some of the foregoing distinctions are also recited in claim 11. In addition, claim 11 recites other features that make it patentable over the teachings of the Alisobhani patent. For example, claim 11 recites the step of searching for

VA 761393.1

transitions of cycle periods in an input data stream including a number of subsections "to determine a transition time for each of the subsections." It is not apparent how the Alisobhani patent is being interpreted to disclose this claimed subject matter. The Office Action does not explain what is considered to be the subsections of the input data stream, nor the determination of a transition time for each such subsection.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2 and 11 are not anticipated by the disclosure of the Alisobhani patent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: __July 6, 2005__    By: _____
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

VA 761393.1